DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 550 EA 006 928

AUTHOR Auton, Sylvia
TITLE The Life of a Federal Advisory Council in Education.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (60th, Washington, D.C., March 31-April 4, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; Budgeting; *Citizen Participation; *Educational Programs; Educational Research; Federal Government; *Federal Programs; Individual Characteristics; Organizational Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Often federal legislation that creates educational programs also creates advisory councils to review and evaluate these programs. Such councils provide opportunities for close citizen participation in overseeing federal policy. The purpose of this paper is to analyze and describe the life of one such council, the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, and to relate this to similar councils in education. Reviewed are the statutory creation of the council, data on the composition of council members, funding patterns, and the selection of issues and strategies chosen by the council in attempting to fulfill its responsibilities. (Author)

ED105550

THE LIFE OF A FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL IN EDUCATION

Sylvia Auton
University of Maryland

A paper for presentation at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

EA 006 928

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to Dr. Joseph Young for his patience, good humor, and grand humanity in both taking his third intern and in sharing with her his "cosmic" view of education.

The author wishes to thank:

former staff members Dr. William Foskett and Dr. Clement Lausberg for sharing with her their experiences of working with the Council,

all of the members of the Council who responded to the questionnaire and, especially, to those who gave personal reactions,

Dr. George Arnstein for his courtesy in the use of Council files and facilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Highlights of the Findings..... 2

Discussion

Federal Advisory Councils 3

Members of the Council 5

Staff and the Organization of the Council 12

Interpretations of the Council's Role and of the Members' Participation 17

Council Endeavors 24

Impact and Improvements.....34

THE LIFE OF A FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL IN EDUCATION

Introd ction

September 22, 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson announced the appointment of the first fifteen members of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development (see Appendix A for a complete list of Council members). This presidentially appointed Council was created by the authority of PL 90-35, the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), passed June 29 of the same year (1). The EPD Act was one of the three major pieces of education legislation to come out of Congress in the decade of the 60's.

Starting with those first fifteen members, fifty-three citizens have been appointed as members of the Council by either Presidents Johnson, Nixon, or Ford.* Almost without exception, the council members have come together for three days every three months since November of 1967 to carry out their legislated responsibility of:

> "...reviewing the operations of (the EPDA) and of all other Federal programs for the training and development of educational personnel, evaluating (the effectiveness of such legislation) in meeting needs for additional educational personnel, and in achieving improved quality in training programs as evidenced in the competency of the persons receiving such training when entering positions in the field of education,...(and) advising the Secretary and the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of (the EPDA) and other matters, relating to the purposes of (the EPDA), on which their advice may be requested."(2)

This summer the law authorizing all EPD funded functions, including the Council, is due to expire. Soon the Congress will deliberate on whether to extend the life of the EPD

*Several members have received double appointments, but for the purposes of this study they are counted only once.

legislation, modified or intact, to propose new legislation of a radically different character for the training of educational personnel, or to allow the legislation to expire with no continuation effort of any kind. Recognizing this, it seemed both timely and natural to ask how the EPD Council nad interpreted its legislative mandate and what problems and concerns the Council faced in attempting to carry out its responsibilities.

Information collected in this study came from several sources:--from a one year's personal perspective as an intern on the staff of the Council (in conjunction with a Washington Internship in Education), --from a review of the Council activities as contained in public documents and in the Council files, --from conversations and correspondence with Council members, officials of the Federal government, and former Council staff members, --and from the results of a questionnaire mailed to all Council members appointed to the Council since its creation.

Highlights of the Findings

The main points that emerged from this study were the following:

1--In general, the Council members approached their responsibilities with seriousness, sincere concern for the problems of the training of educational personnel, often uncertainty as to the effectiveness of the Council, and often frustrations with perceived limited impact or lack of receptive audience.

2--The Council interpreted its legislative charter broadly: its concerns have been for all levels of educational personnel, early childhood through higher education, and for all Federal programs involving the training of educational personnel, not only those funded under the EPDA.

3--It has regarded its proper audience for reports and recommendations to be members of the Congress, in particular, members of the education committees of the House and Senate; and members of the Executive Branch, in particular, the Secretary and Commissioner of Education.

4--It has been hobbled by a lack of funds, especially in several of its early years, and, consequently, has not had the resources to conduct many intensive studies.

5--In the past, the reviews and evaluations of Federal educational personnel training programs that have been conducted have not been made public.

6--It has issued thoughtful reports on aspects of educational personnel training and has boldly attacked several fundamental questions related to the evaluation of such Federal training efforts.

Discussion: Federal Advisory Councils

To put the EPD Council in proper perspective it is helpful to recall that advisory councils are not new to the Federal government. Reference to such groups can be traced back to America's first President, George Washington (3). Nor are they few in number. In 1969, there were at least 1500 advisory councils/committees with an annual operating cost totaling over $64 million (4). The Office of Education currently lists 16 advisory councils, one of which is the EPD Council. In view of the number of councils and the amount of money spent, it is easy to understand why such groups are collectively called the fifth branch of government.*

In recent years, advisory councils have been the subject of close scrutiny in the Congress. In 1970 the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives held five days of hearings on presi-

* Three constitutionally created branches and the regulatory boards.

dential advisory committees*(5). Similar hearings were held in the Senate (6). In addition, the Committee on Government Operations in the House issued the report: The Role and Effectiveness of Federal Advisory Committees(7). Growing out of these investigations, the Federal Advisory Committee Act was passed in October of 1972 (8). The purpose of the Act was: "To authorize the establishment of a system governing the creation and operation of advisory councils in the executive branch of the Federal Government..."(9). This Act moved in the direction of bringing sound management principles to the advisory committee system and of bringing advisory committee proceedings to the attention of the public. For example, by law advisory council meetings must be open to the public, notice must appear in the Federal Register prior to the meeting, detailed minutes must be kept of advisory committee meetings and must be made available to the public at the actual reproduction costs.

Not all parts of the law have been equally effective. For example, the law sought to make advisory committee papers "available to public inspection and use"(10). It named the Library of Congress the recipient of all reports and papers of advisory committees and authorized the Librarian of Congress to establish a depository for such reports. Unfortunately, as is too often the case, the authorizing legislation makes no provision for appropriations. Thus, the results are the following: the Librarian of Congress will receive advisory committee documents but will spend none of the Library's funds to catalogue, or in other ways, make the

* Committee and council are used interchangeably in this paper.

documents accessible. Based on a personal visit to the Library this fall, it is true that some of the more recent reports of the EPD Council are well kept. In fact, after locating a librarian who knew of the reports, he remarked that only one other inquirer had come to inspect any of them--a member of a Ralph Nader public interest group. However, one might ask, who would stumble into the "Staff Only" stacks of the Rare Books room searching for uncatalogued advisory council reports?

Much more could be said about Federal advisory councils, but, hopefully, the few comments made above will help to provide a broader context in which to place the specific facts about the EPD Council that will now be presented.

Members of the Council

All members of the EPD Council receive their appointments from the President in office and serve at his pleasure. The Chairman is appointed by the President; the Council elects its own Vice-Chairman and Treasurer. Each member receives financial compensation of $100/day plus travel and living expenses for each day of Council meetings. Members are appointed on staggered terms of from 1-3 years; a full complement of members is 15. As with other councils, new members have not always been appointed before out-going members left. Several times the Council has met with four or five places vacant. New legislation (PL 93-380) prevents long delays in the appointment process, but the Council has been caught in such waiting periods several times in the past (11).

Data available on all members include: sex, race, geographical and professional representation. Of the 53 members appointed, 72% have been male (28% female), and 85% have been from racial/ethnic majority groups (15% minorities). Geographical representation has been fairly even (Table 1).

Table 1. Geographical Distribution of Council Members

Area	Number[+]
Northeast	12
South	12
Midwest	11
West	11
Southwest	7

[+]Total population: N=53

Over 60% were teachers or educational administrators.

Other information about Council members was collected using a questionnaire adapted from a study of all Federal educational advisory councils by Cronin and Thomas (12). Seventy percent of the Council members responded to the questionnaire* Of these, 77% had been on the Council for at least 1½ years.

After President Nixon took office he accepted the resignations of the Johnson appointees and selected members of his own choosing, reappointing some from the original group. From this study it appears that at least 53% of the Johnson advisers were Democrats, 6% Republicans, and 13% Independents (Table 2).

* Of the total 53 members: 2 are deceased

35 responded to the questionnaire (35/50=70%)
6 declined to participate due to their short tenure on the Council (1-2 meetings each)

Of the 10 members whose questionnaires remain outstanding, 3 resigned soon after being appointed.

Table 2. Political Party of Council Members

Party	Johnson appointees (%)+	Nixon/Ford appointees (%)++
Democratic	53	11
Republican	6	37
Independent	13	16
NA/Unknown	28	36
	100	100

+N(Johnson)=15; ++N(Nixon/Ford)=38

All the Johnson advisers who responded listed themselves as liberals. During the Republican administrations of Nixon and Ford, the composition of the Council changed in the likely direction of more Republicans and fewer Democrats. As far as the data indicate, liberals and conservatives were split at 26% each.

Forty-six percent of all the respondents declared that they had been active in a political party; of these, 44% believed political experience was important in their selection to the Council (57% of the respondents felt professional experience alone was important). While several Council members urged that appointments be non-political and members be recruited for professional or representational characteristics, it seems clear that political considerations by the administration have entered the selection process, as they would with any presidentially appointed body.

On educational background the Council members have been above average (Table 3).

Table 3. Educational Level

Degree	Reply (%)+
Doctorates	63
Master's Degrees	14
Bachelor's Degrees	20
NA	3
	100

+Number in sample=35

More than 82% were over age 35 at the time of appointment and almost half (48%) were over 45. These results are quite consistent with the Cronin and Thomas study (13).

According to the EPD statute, "a majority of (Council members) shall be engaged in teaching or in the education of teachers" (14). In 1973, the executive director felt that only four of the fifteen members had direct involvement in teacher education, although the majority satisfied the qualification of involvement in teacher education. He wrote:

> "(1) it is imperative that most of those appointed have had a very substantial and direct involvement in some aspect of the training and development of educational personnel; (2) it is desirable that the appointees have had some experience in policy-making in this particular field of endeavor; and (3) it is desirable that they have had some direct involvement in at least one Federal program dealing with this particular field" (15).

The lack of such expertise on the Council or the need for it was not mentioned by Council members when asked to comment on how to improve the operation and functioning of the Council, nor was this the predominant sentiment expressed in response to the statement: If positive recommendations are sought from an advisory committee this should be composed of experts rather than representatives. Sixty-six percent of the respondents either disagreed or tended to disagree with the statement;

23% agreed or tended to agree. Several members felt that advisory councils are some of the few places where the unorganized public can be given a voice; the professionals already have numerous associations, e.g., National Education Association, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

When asked for their feelings regarding adequate representation of special interests on the Council, approximately half the members were satisfied (Table 4). Interests members felt were not adequately represented included: the general public, students, special categories of educators (e.g.,classroom teachers), and special categories of citizens (e.g., those not in the political party of the President),(Table 5).

Table 4. Council Members' Perceptions of Adequate Representation on the Council of Special Interests+

Categories	Repl's (%)++
Adequate balance/satisfied	43
Not satisfied	14
NA/Don't know/Diverse Comments	43
	100

+The question was open-ended. The question read: "Some people think that certain interests are not sufficiently represented in Advisory units such as EPD, others feel that most, if not all interests, are adequately spoken for. How do you feel about this?"

++Number in sample=35.

Table 5. Council Member's Listing of Interests Not Sufficiently Represented on the Council[+]

Categories	Reply (%)[++]
Public members	14
Special categories of Public members	6
Students	6
Special categories of Educators	12
NA/Don't know	62
	100

[+]The question was open-ended. The question read: What interests, if any, are not sufficiently represented?" This question was the sequel to the question in Table 2.
[++]Number in sample=35

While recognizing the need for public members, also, the executive director explained his position as follows:

> "members of a Council like this must deal with a myriad of problems specific to education professions development. Thus, a member must come on board with an already developed context within which he can grapple with these problems. There just is not enough time to 'learn on the job,' however able the person is. He must also be able to formulate solutions to the problems, solutions which take into account a whole range of realities which he must already have in his head. Otherwise, the Council will not be fully productive, or may become a captive to the views of staff or outside experts"(16).

Here is the classic division in thought on how advisory councils should be constituted: predominantly experts or predominantly representatives. In this case, the staff was leaning toward experts and the Council members were either satisfied or were leaning toward more general representation. Why? On the part of the staff, a possible explanation is that members with expertise in teacher education could play an active role in analyzing issues and formulating positions and, hence, increase the resources and productivity of the staff, and the Council. With greater numbers of public members, or members

without specific expertise in teacher education, the staff is more likely to be called upon to present alternative positions, already formulated, which can be reacted to by the members. Given the size of the EPD Council staff, 1-2 people, it seems reasonable for the executive director to favor more experts.

On the part of the Council members, many of whom feel most concerned for "the public interest" (Table 6), it is quite reasonable to expect them to want more representatives of the public on the Council.

Table 6. Council members' Interest Group Accountability Perspectives+

Concerns or Interests	Reply (%)++
The public interest	39
Students, children	30
Educational personnel	27
Other concerns	15
NA	9
	120

+The question was open-ended. The question read: "When you have participated in the work of the EPD Council, whose concerns are uppermost in your mind--whom do you speak for?" Multiple responses were allowed; percentages sum to more than 100

++Number in sample=35.

Both staff and Council members felt lack of time to be a problem. Sixty-six percent were on the "agree" side of the question:"As presently set up and used, advisory councils do not permit much time for critical in-depth discussions of policy and program alternatives. This compares with seventy-five percent who felt this way in the Cronin and Thomas study(17). However, that study included councils without staffs of their own: staffs on loan from the Office of Education.

Learning about the work and functioning of the Council

itself took time: 51% said it took a meeting or two and 37% said it took a year or more. Even for staff, working daily with the issues and problems in the Council's domain, an orientation period was necessary. A former staff member wrote: "As a newcomer to the Federal scene, I have found that making sense of the mountains and mazes of information related to EPD can be a confusing, baffling task"(18).

On that note, let us turn to a discussion of the staff and the operating organization of the Council.

Staff and the Organization of the Council

The first executive director of the Council was Dr. Joseph Young, who served as executive director from 1968 through 1974. The second, and current, executive director is Dr. George Arnstein. Until 1971, the executive director was the only staff of the Council except for secretarial help. From 1971, the staff has been of constant size with 1 or 2 other professionals in the office each year. Interns have filled 3 of the 4 professional positions; the other was filled by a research assistant hired for one year. Consequently, except for the first executive director, longevity on the Council has been low, and much of the staff has been composed of junior members. Having roughly half of the staff new each year has meant that the Council has not been able to rely on a full complement of professionals for continued responsibility in any important area. Given a history of tight budgets this staffing pattern may have been a wise decision, but high staff turnover appears to be of little help in a situation in which there is yearly turnover in the Council itself. In any event, the former executive director, Young, has been one of the few key figures in the Council history.

Both executive directors have had backgrounds in education. Young came to the staff from Harvard, where he was an administrator in the Graduate School of Education and a doctoral candidate; Arnstein came from a joint appointment with the Educational Testing Service and the College Entrance Examination Board.

Both executive directors have had responsibility for being the administrative official for the Council's Washington office; for arranging the Council meetings, which are held every three months; for preparing position papers on issues of Council concerns; for keeping abreast of developments in Federal programs in the EPD area; and for representing the Council at public meetings. The executive directors have been responsible, also, for hiring and managing the staff. Such responsibilities are common in other Federal advisory councils operating with their own budgets. The manner in which the Council administered its budget varied.

For several years the Council contracted with Harvard for the services of the staff and for the operation of the Council's office. This was referred to as "the Harvard Contract." During that time, Harvard was the fiscal agent for Council funds and paid for supplies and services as the Council directed. Later the Council received its funds directly, had a checking account, and kept its own books--working in some respects like a not-for-profit corporation. In 1974, following an exposé in the Washington Post on the high salary of an executive director in another council, the administration issued a ruling whereby all Council funds would be administered thereafter through the Federal Departments and council staffs would be on the Civil Service payrolls--

although not subject to Civil Service hiring and promotion regulations (19). The Council now depends upon the Office of Education (OE) for both its funding and its services, e.g., paychecks and paperclips. Funding has always come from OE.

The original legislation establishing the Council authorized $200,000 for Council operations, but the Congress has never appropriated such sums, or, indeed, any sums for the Council per se. This is a common plight of advisory councils. Cronin and Thomas remark:

> "Funds are rarely appropriated when Congress creates advisory councils. Instead, these councils almost always compete for very limited salary and expense funds allocated for departmental administration" (20).

The EPD Council has received funds from EPD program money and from general salary and expense money in the Office of Education. This fiscal dependence on the very agency the Council is to advise leaves much to be desired. As one Council member expressed it:"Whatever funds were available came from the Commissioner of Education's discretionary fund. This did not prove to be a drawback since our relationship with (the Commissioner) was a positive one, but this form of funding does have potential problems."

Regarding the level of funding, the Council members were divided: 48% believed the Council was adequately or well funded and 39% believed it was poorly funded. Those appointed to the Council since 1971 appeared more content with the funding level than those appointed earlier(80% "at least adequate" vs. 45% "at least adequate"). Prior to 1971 the Council budget hovered around $100,000--enough to pay Council meeting and office expenses. Since that time its budget has

increased to the $135,000-$150,000 range. However, timing of appointments was probably not the only factor in the split. Aspirations and interpretation of the Council role undoubtedly played a part. One Council member wrote that the budget was: "NOT adequate to accomplish the broad purposes of the law; but, certainly adequate for what was undertaken and to cover things that were not undertaken." The haunting question is whether anyone seriously expected the Council to accomplish the broad purposes of the law. Certainly the Council legislation was unrealistically wide for the Council to interpret literally.

A final comment on the budget was made by a Council member who indicated that with better funding the Council members could have better informed themselves by being able to make occasional site visits to EPDA programs. As it was in the past, the Council conducted virtually all of its business in Washington (the last two meetings were outside Washington as was a meeting several years ago). Whether or not funding was the determining factor it is true that 47% of the questionnaire respondents have never visited an EPDA program as Council members and 20% have never had the occasion to do so for any reason. Certainly for Council members to have a sense of the operations of the programs and to attune themselves to inside problems, direct experience is invaluable.

By meeting in Washington, the Council was able to call upon program officers and policy makers in the bureaucracies. It was not uncommon for the Commissioner of Education to make an appearance at a Council meeting. Often Council members were briefed by top level OE personnel, such as an Assistant Commissioner, or by chief spokesmen in the professional agencies or

in other departments of the government. At times, the members went to Capitol Hill to be informally addressed by a member of Congress. Less often did they meet with council members or staff of other advisory councils or with While House staff.

Preparation for such meetings was the responsibility of the staff: not only to set up the agenda but to mail to Council members relevant information prior to the meetings. Eighty-one percent of the members characterized the reading as "a great deal" or "much." One member commented that the amount was not the only factor of importance: timing was as crucial. A complaint was that information did not always arrive with enough lead time for members to prepare themselves. Similar notes of discontent were voiced regarding delays in issuing reports. However, on the whole, about 70% of the members felt the quality of the staff work was "very high" or "quite adequate."

The majority of members were satisfied ("very well" or "fairly well") with the organizational structure of the Council meetings but a sizeable percentage (26%) were not. Of these, some felt the meetings were not productive listening to speakers; others felt that the meetings only became productive after the Council reorganized into subcommittees that looked at specific topics, e.g., manpower, evaluation; still others felt that the Council needed more exposure to the views of Congress and the White House staff. Perhaps these differences on organizational matters reflect the differences felt on substantive matters. Over 50% of the members responding felt that a "great deal" or "much" difference of opinion existed among Council members. While this is to be

expected in a body of 15 people, it also meant that extended discussions took place over the proper role of the Council, the nature of the Council reports, the choice of issues for consideration, etc. Much of this is lost on an examination of the "output" of the Council but it is important to bear in mind that such deliberations set the stage for the direction the Council chose to go.

As among the Council members themselves, there were differences of opinion on substantive matters between the Council and the staff: over one-forth of the respondents felt this difference was a "great deal" or "much." Some of the differences can be explained by noting that councils would like to be responsive to more issues than their staffs could address with reasonable care. Letters of concern are a common vehicle to express the opinions of a council, and are always replied to, but in an environment where the voice of any council is one among the many there is no substitute for a strong constituency or a strong argument. A strong constituency the Council did not have... which does not make it unique. On the contrary, on that grounds it can join the ranks of much of the EPDA.

Interpretations of the Council's Role & of the Members' Participation

In exactly the same order as in the Cronin and Thomas study, the EPD Council members indicated their views on the functions of the Council (Table 7), (21). As can be inferred, the members have viewed the Council as a policy advisory group first, a management advisory group second, and only next as an influence group for special interests, for the programs of the administrations, etc. This latter, in fact, has not been a 17

strong characteristic of the Council. The most visible instance of a position taken by the Council with respect to an administration initiative was the Council's position on Educational Renewal in the Office of Education (22). On balance, one would have to say that the Council spoke out against the implementation of the idea. The Council's role on Renewal will be referred to again in the next section.

Table 7. Council Members' Ranking of Functions[+]

Functions	Reply (%)[++] Characteristic	Not Characteristic	NA
1. Advise on program priorities	86	6	8
2. Review guidlines and regulations	78	14	8
3. Make managerial suggestions	42	44	14
4. Work out new legislation	31	50	17
5. Work on publicity and support	33	53	14
6. Do lobbying work.	33	56	11

[+]The question was presented in a closed-ended format:"There are many functions characteristic of Advisory Councils. Which of the following are characteristic of your unit?"

[++]Number in sample=35

One further remark regarding the outcomes in Table 7 should be made. The topic of new legislation is receiving noticeable attention from the Council this year primarily because of the imminent expiration of the Education Professions Development Act. The next annual report of the Council will undoubtedly speak to the issue of the need for new legislation.

The programs for the training of educational personnel that were of particular interest to the Council members varied almost from person to person; this was true of their own areas of expertise, also. The specific programs--Teacher Corps, Career Opportunities Program, the Trainers of the Trainers of Teachers--and the fellowships under EPDA were each of particular concern to several of the members, but also

receiving attention were training programs for personnel in higher education and in special subject fields at all levels, and programs for particular groups of children such as the disadvantaged, bilingual, and Indian. This wide range of interests and the concomitant wide range in the legislation offered a challenge for the Council but also a problem of how to narrow its scope to manageable size.

The committee system, introduced in 1971, helped focus the interests of like-minded members, conserved meeting time, and let the members contribute their skills in committee work sessions of their own choosing.

In general, the members felt positive about their own roles on the Council. Eighty percent remarked that it was valuable personally (14% "hard to say") and 63% said their participation was valuable for the Council (26% "hard to say"). They were not so positive about the value of their participation for the Office of Education: only 37% thought it was valuable for OE, 46% "hard to say" and 14% thought it was not valuable for OE. From several off-the-record conversations with both present and former staff members at OE, a common opinion was that the Council produced several noteworthy reports but was fairly marginal in the planning and decisions of the bureaucracy. In part, this is the nature of an advisory council which does not have authority to make its decisions heard, and, in part, it was the result of a loose focus that resisted seeing the EPD Bureau as a special part of Council concerns. How valid or reliable are such remarks is, of course, open to question.

On another questionnaire item about member participation, half of those responding felt they had "much more influence" or "somewhat more influence" than other members on the Council; only one person thought he had much less. Seventy-five percent felt their performance was average or above. Few members, however, stood out in the minds of the others as giving the Council special leadership or direction: overall, the Chairpersons were looked on as having primary importance, followed by the executive directors. While this does not diminish the significance of any Council member, it underlines the importance of the commitment and talents of persons holding these two key posts.

Noting that 80% of the members thought their appointments were valuable for them, it seemed unusual,at first, to see that only 45% indicated they would definitely (or probably) like to continue to serve on the Council, and, almost the same percentage, 42%, were as convinced that they would not want to serve on the Council. From cross-tabulations it appears that such sentiment is not related to length of time on the Council (measured in number of meetings) but somewhat related to participation on other Federal advisory committees. (Of those currently on a non-education Federal advisory committee and recently on more than one education Federal advisory committee (6), 5 were not desirous of being reappointed to the EPD Council (83%); whereas, of those currently on no non-education Federal advisory committee and recently on only one education Federal advisory committee (12), 4 were not desirous of being reappointed (33%).) This result indicates willingness to participate as an advisor decreases with increasing appointments--as might be expected.

20

The way in which the Council members interpreted the Council role can be seen by the member's individual comments, by an analysis of role preference, by an analysis of whom the Council viewed as its audience, and to whom it felt accountable. The comments that follow are illustrative of the range of interpretation of what the Council members interpret as the Council role.

> The Council's role is to:
> --survey the overall Federal effort in EPD; to define its direction, as seen from this survey; to suggest different directions, or concerns, arising from the survey,
> --represent the public in influencing the Federal role and responsibility,
> --identify areas of interest requiring attention and to develop specific recommendations for solution or improvement,
> --react to current issues and trends, to point out problem areas, and to seek ways of solving problems,
> --assess the level of performance of OE and other Federal agencies in carrying out educational policy and address the fundamental problems of education,
> --let the Executive Branch and the Congress know what is going on in education around the country; to let them know what the problems and needs are,
> --perform independent research and analysis of EPD quality,
> --help frame legislative recommendations to Congress.

Members reactions to the statements in Table 8 indicate aspects of their interpretation of the role of advisory councils in general. The findings from the data in this table mirror those in the original survey (23). Conceptually, the EPD Council members view member's roles primarily as "advisors," secondly as "directors," and only minimally as "supporters." The members view of the EPD Council (Table 7) is consistent with their views of Federal advisory councils in general.

Table 8. Council Members' Role Preferences[+]

Role Preference	Reply (%)[++] Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Reply
Advisory Council members should seek out and advocate solutions for major public policy problems.	49	23	14	3	12
Advisory Councils serve very much like a Board of Directors, by lending advice and opinions to new administrative and policy proposals.	20	37	23	17	3
An important function for Advisory Councils is to marshall public support and legislative backing for new federal public policy.	23	17	28	23	9

[+]The statements to the left were included in a closed-choice questionnaire.

[++]Number in sample=35.

By law, the Council is required to submit an annual report to the President and Congress. This officially establishes one audience for Council advice. However, the primary targets in the Congress are the members of the House:

-- Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations,
-- General Subcommittee on Education, Select Subcommittee on Education, and Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor

and the Senate:

-- Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations,
-- Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The authorizing subcommittees with jurisdiction over the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities have also been of special interest to the Council.

In the Executive Branch the primary targets have been the Secretary and Commissioner of Education, although there has been strong sentiment by some of the Council members that the Council's ideas need to have direct flow to White House staff members.

A final item in this section bears on the question of accountability perceptions of Council members. The Council members have a stronger sense of responsibility to the Executive Branch than to the Office of Education (Table 9). This viewpoint has been of long-standing (24). The Congress and Home State responsibilities rank next, but in view of the fact that the response "Congress" needed to be written in, it is likely that this percentage would have been even higher if "Congress" had been included explicitly in the list; similarly, this is the case for "The Public."

Table 9. Council Members' General Accountability Perspectives[+]

Accountability focus	Reply (%)[++] High	Low	None	No Reply
Executive Branch	46	17	31	6
U.S. Office of Education	26	37	31	6
Congress	17	3	-	-
Home State	17	26	51	6
Professional Association	14	34	46	6
The Public	11	-	-	-
Interest Group Organizations	3	34	51	12

[+]The question read:" In terms of your service on the EPD Council, what degree of accountability do you feel toward the following institutions or persons? (Treat each separately). Notice that "Congress" and "The Public" were write-ins.

[++]Number in sample=35.

Council Endeavors

Some of the Council's interests have led to the publication of reports; some have led to draft documents that have been regarded as working papers for further consideration. The Council has published 10 reports since its formation: 8 have been written internally under the direction and leadership of the Council members, 2 have been commissioned to outside authors--one a former Council member, Rupert Evans, wrote the report on vocational education (Appendix B).

The first Council report was due in January 1968, three months after the members were first appointed and shortly after the executive director was hired. That report was a "declaration of intent." It stated that the Council was ready to begin its duties and offered several conclusions. Some of the major conclusions were:

> --the EPDA "has the potential for producing a profound effect on American education,"
> --the EPDA language makes clear that "the emphasis shall be on quality,"
> --the EPDA "should be funded for FY 69 at levels close to the amounts authorized,"
> --the task of the Council will be to establish connections between "the goals of education and the aspirations of a people for the condition of its society in the years ahead" and "recommendations for policy in education,"
> --the Council will "undertake independent inquiries only when it has been determined that data available from other agencies, public or private, are not suitable for (the Council) purposes,"
> --"detailed involvement with the current administration of one Act alone--important as that Act may be--would serve to lessen the Council's effectiveness in discharging the functions for which it has prime responsibility. Those functions certainly include careful review of the policies and procedures related to P.L. 90-35, but also include similar attention to many other pieces of legislation."

In the summer of that same year, 1968, the Council arranged for "hearings" to be held in New York City and in Atlanta, Georgia. The intent of the meetings was to get a sense of how the variety of Federal training programs for the education professions was affecting the two areas of the country. People at many administrative levels--professors, directors of graduate studies, assistant superintendents, department chairmen--met with members of the Council in informal conversations, bringing with them prepared remarks concerning their programs (25). The acts these programs represented were the:

-- National Foundation for Arts & Humanities Act
-- Higher Education Act
-- National Defense Education Act
-- Economic Opportunity Act
-- National Science Foundation Act
-- Elementary and Secondary Education Act
-- Vocational Education Act.

No summary or recommendations from those hearings were made public, but undoubtedly the "witnesses" gave Council members information and insights that were of value in writing the second annual report.

The second report, issued in January of 1969, presented Council recommendations to the President, Congress, and to the Commissioner of Education on a wide ranging series of topics: adequate funding, authorization request for proposal development centers, support for long-range contracts, effective organization in OE, priority funding for educational personnel serving students in low-income families, and assessment of educational manpower needs. The report was well received.

The third report, issued soon thereafter in May 1969, was not addressed to multiple problems, but focused a critical eye on the problem of evaluation.

One of the central responsibilities given to the Council by the Congress was the evaluation of Federal programs related to the training of educational personnel. There were at least two difficulties in trying to fulfill this responsibility. First, the Council had insufficient funds to conduct in-depth evaluations, as typified by those of Headstart. Second, by the nature of advisory councils, highly technical reports seemed neither warranted nor possible without outside expertise. This led the Council to review existing evaluations in the hope of being able to draw out conclusions about the programs of a more general character. What ensued was the Council's dissatisfaction with the evaluations being conducted. The third report, Evaluation of Educational Programs, begins with the following:

> "Evaluation of the wrong kind, at the wrong time, and for the wrong reasons has characterized too much of the current effort to appraise educational reforms. Meaningless evaluation is ruining the cutting edge of educational innovation."

In specific terms the Council cited such malpractices as:

--"premature evaluation,"
--"almost total preoccupation with so-called 'hard data' developed by mass use of standarized tests,"
--"concern only for final results with little effort to determine why the objectives of a project were or were not achieved,"
--"lack of imagination in selecting types of evaluation that are applicable to the special nature or purposes of an educational activity, or to its stage of development,"
--"requirements that all projects in a program make provisions for evaluation,"
--"a tendency to construe tentative findings as 'proof.'"

The publication of this report marked the start of a long encounter between the Council and the world of evaluation; but, first, the Council raised the cry for educational leadership.

In October 1969, the fourth Council report, Leadership and the Educational Needs of the Nation, was released with this summary:

> "This report
>
> ...is bluntly critical of what is called a 'default' on the part of the Federal government in not doing its share in the support of American education;
>
> ...cites examples of the absence of bold planning and specific reductions in appropriations as illustrative of this defalt;
>
> ...says the only signal coming from the Federal government is 'retrenchment' which is creating a mood that is adversely affecting reform and improvement;
>
> ...compares this mood of withdrawal with the mood in schools and colleges which is characterized as a 'worsening climate';
>
> ...calls for an end to the war and a forthright attack on our domestic problems--especially on education;
>
> ...says there is a desperate need for national leadership and calls for either the Executive Branch or the Congress to provide it."

This report, described as "brief, yet powerful" was a reaction to President Nixon's budget cuts for education. Several professional journals carried exerpts of the report or reproduced it in its entirety (26). It is probably not coincidental that a few months thereafter President Nixon asked for the resignation of the members of the Council--who, it will be recalled, were not his appointees. The next major step the Council took was back on the road to evaluate Federal programs.

As the Council indicated in its first report, it would undertake independent inquiries if it could not find data available suitable for its purposes. In the case of evaluation of Federal programs, it was ready to strike out on its own. To conserve its funds and to provide soon-to-be professionals with an opportunity to learn about programs in the Federal government, the Council contracted with Robert McCarthy at Harvard for an evaluation study. The contract specified "undertaking an inquiry and evaluation of a program in the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (BEPD), specifically the Early Childhood Training Program." McCarthy was to direct a team of research assistants in carrying out the study for a period of ten weeks, beginning the middle of June 1970 (27). By the beginning of October the first draft of the report was presented to the Council (28).

The intention of the Council was to make appropriate revisions in the report, append reactions and critiques from the Bureau and experts in the field, and submit the report to the President and Congress (29).

As it turned out, the study raised more questions in the minds of the Council members than it answered. At the October 1970 Council meeting several objections were raised to making the report public. Included among these were:

1--the report should reflect national concern, not just one bureau;--the Council needed to take a more coordinated and comprehensive look at early childhood, analyzing what other agencies besides the BEPD were doing in this area,
2--the report needed more exploration on the training and experience of the personnel in the Early Childhood Branch (ECB),
3--the report needed more history of the ECB and of the Division of School Programs in which it operated(30).

Many questions were raised:

> --"Do we need or want more licenses, professionalization, and certification requirements in early childhood education?"
> --"Is $5 million adequate for training in early childhood? Is it being spent in the best possible way?"
> --"Is the current funding pattern among institutions of higher education, state education agencies, and local education agencies satisfactory?"
> --"When and where will the 'multiplier' effect take place? How can we tell if it is or is not occurring?"
> --"What is the best balance between breadth and depth in Council studies like this one in early childhood?"

At the end of its deliberations the Council decided that it should continue to study the problems in the area of early childhood education, but to postpone issuing a report until it was better prepared to answer its own questions. A public report was never made, although the Council continued its interest through 1971 and 1972 (31). Two events worked to channel the energy of the Council along different paths.

The first occurred even as the early childhood study was being conducted. The Council knew that such a study would not be its ultimate statement on the evaluation of educational programs. What was needed was a project of considerable scope with sufficient time to investigate the issues thoroughly. In August of 1970 the Council went back to Harvard, this time to David Cohen, Executive Director, Center for Educational Policy Research, and Walter McCann, Director of the Administrative Career Program, contracting with them to do a year long evaluation study with the assistance of graduate students enrolled in a seminar on "Education and Policy." Their report became known as "The Harvard

Report," and, to a group in Washington, famous and infamous in the same breath.

As originally outlined, the study was to encompass several agencies. In a letter to one of the study authors the executive director wrote:

> "Several studies need to be done--the evaluation of the policy and programs of the National Science Foundation concerned with training, a similar kind of study of OE's Bureau of Higher Education. These would be pursued in the manner similar to the inquiry team now working on the Early Childhood Training Program. There is also a need for in-depth papers on topics like accountability, performance certification, manpower, Federal policies on evaluation, etc."(32).

Later, in a letter to an OE official he indicated a similar intention:

> "The study will be concerned with evaluation policies and procedures affecting programs which deal with the training and development of personnel in both higher education and the elementary and secondary schools; it will embrace the evaluation policies and procedures of the several major Federal agencies which administer education professions development programs (i.e., the Department of HEW, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, etc.) (33).

At some point, the focus of the report narrowed and all agencies except BEPD in OE were excluded. Despite this, the report sent to the Council must have involved an extraordinary amount of work and undoubtedly there were great expectations on both sides. Clearly the authors felt they understood the wishes of the Council and were looking forward to the report's acceptance. In May, 1971, they wrote to Young: "We are quite pleased with the progress of the work and the quality of the papers so far" (34).

The initial draft was forwarded to the Council's evaluation committee: that committee was charged with making recommendations on the report to the full Council. After careful review-- of over 400 pages!--the committee decided that the report, as it stood, would not help the Council answer the question: What should the policies and procedures of the Federal government be with reference to the evaluation of those efforts relating to the training and development of educational personnel? Also, there was a definite feeling that the report highlighted personal behaviors and rattled skeletons in a manner that was not germane in attempting to answer the Council's question. The draft was revised, several times, and an exchange of ideas continued until the fall of 1971.

By then, weariness must have set in on both parties. The Council accepted the final report December 1971, although plans for issuing a public report were not clear (35). It is difficult to tell what would have happened if the second major event had not occurred: Educational Renewal.

Educational Renewal was an initiative on the part of the Office of Education that began getting considerable heat from the Congress as the year progressed.(36). The Council also had reservations about Renewal and was meeting with OE policy makers to keep abreast of their planning (37). Then, in the spring--without warning--part of the "Harvard Report" was leaked to the Congress by a graduate student who had been a principal writer of the report (38). The report added fuel to the Renewal fires. Since staff members at OE felt the draft was in need of "considerable work" it goes without saying that OE found this disclosure objectionable;

the Council found that the research for its long planned for evaluation report (or at least some part thereof) had been unleashed in a manner it was certainly opposed to. In March, letters were sent to key members of OE and the Congress clarifying the Council's role in the release; a draft statement setting forth a position on Educational Renewal was adopted by the Council. In May, the Council brought out its Report on Educational Renewal. The touchstone for determining the Council's stand was Windows to the Bureaucracy.

Windows was born because the Council found that statements of program policies were lacking or were insufficiently described to be of adequate use in guiding program activities. This fact confounded evaluation efforts at one of the first links in the chain. Windows was published in January 1972 after a chapter on the "Harvard Report" was closed and before the Renewal scene clamored for the Council's attention. It's appearance marked the end of a prolonged effort to give the report a sound footing and to support its conclusions with examples from several Federal agencies.

The report was one of the most applauded Council endeavors, gained favor on both sides of the Federal aisle--Executive Branch and Congress--and was prominently mentioned by Council members as one of the best things the Council had done. Favorite quotes about Windows were:

> (Representative John Brademas (D-Ind.), Chairman of the Select Committee on Education)
>
> "...so you will see why I found your 'Windows' report so fascinating and so helpful. In my view it represents one of the few efforts, of which I'm aware, to take a look at Federal decision-making in education in a kind of thoughtful and realistic way and to conceptualize some of the problems. We are in it but often we don't stand back from

what it is we are doing and say"what are we doing?" and maybe we could do it better. So I regard it as a really pioneer effort..."(39).

(Representative William A. Steiger (R-Wisc.))

"...Number one, on the question of Advisory Committee Reports, and specifically yours, and especially Windows to the Bureaucracy: it was a refreshing document. It was one which...from at least my limited experience here in Washington...gave us something which we do not often get. And I'll be honest with you and say that I think most of us have come to be very wary of reports from the myriad Advisory Committees...from HEW as well as from anywhere else. Especially because they don't say anything more than 'the program is an excellent program, the only problem with it is that it lacks money.' Once you've gotten past that problem, you have very little analysis as to whether it is doing, in fact, its job. So simply by way of commendation for what I think is a break in that pattern, yours has been exceptionally well done."(40).

Comparable comments were received from the Senate and multiple copies of the report were requested for the use of staff members in OE as a guide in policy planning. If skeptics partial out a degree of the approbation, attributable to the political savvy of Washington policy makers, there remains a kernel of sentiment that goes beyond polite conventions.

The next two reports: People for the People's College and Vocational Education: Staff Development Priorities for the '70's, were targeted at particular substantive areas--the community-junior colleges and vocational education. Both were written on contract with outside experts and brought hundreds of requests from around the country to the Council offices for complimentary copies. The community-junior college report was released in paperback form as "Teachers for Tomorrow" (41).

The decision to address particular teaching areas was motivated by the Council desire to begin to speak to a number of such areas that had long been held on its priority list. The choice of these two areas was probably due to the timeliness and high visibility of issues that surfaced and the concerns of a few Council members knowledgeable in these two fields.

The Council's last two reports, Evaluation of Education: In Need of Examination and Search for Success, speak to the need for policies governing the conduct of evaluation of Federal educational activities as Windows spoke to the need for policies governing the implementation of educational legislation. Evaluation of Education: In Need of Examination was a brief report which the Council issued as a forerunner of Search for Success. In Search for Success the thesis of the Council's position is developed.

There was to have been a sequel to Windows and Search for Success--the Small Sinews of Government, addressed to budget preparation and review. A draft was written and is now a Council unpublished document. New interpretations, different perspectives, and other priorities of the current Council members and staff are defining the character of the Council's role and of Council reports in their own unique way...as should be the case.

Impact and Improvements

To a large extent, these last topics inevitably have been wound together with topics discussed previously. This section both supplements, and occasionally emphasizes, aspects of the

earlier examinations.

The question of impact is thorny. Both the size of the Council and the dimensions of the problems mitigate against much perceivable impact. Most Council members concluded that the Council's impact was, at best, limited (Table 10). This result is somewhat less than that in the Cronin and Thomas study, but it reflects the same conclusion, "relatively minor impact" (42).

Table 10. Council Members' Assessment of the Council's Impact on Quality and Quantity of New Legislation and Quality of Policy Implementation[+]

Category	Reply (%)[++] Significant	Moderate	Beginning, Limited, or None Yet	Don't Know, or No Reply
New Legislation				
Quality	3	14	52	31
Quantity	-	11	50	39
Policy Implementation	3	11	41	44

[+] The question was presented in a closed-ended format. The question read: "What type of effect or impact have the recommendations of the EPD Council had on the quality and quantity of new legislation and on quality of policy implementation?"

[++] Number in sample=35.

In talking with members of Congress or their staffs, the observation was made that reports themselves rarely bring about change. However, the ideas that emanate from advisory councils can touch other organizations and individuals and create a "multiplier effect." To determine if, or how much, the EPD Council was able to create such an effect is beyond the scope of this study.

Certainly the Council carried its responsibility through the first step: to widely distribute its reports. For its latest report, Search for Success, over 5,000 copies were printed.

35

Copies went to:

--the President and selected members of the White House staff,
--the Congress and members of the staffs of education committees,
--the press, both in Washington and around the country,
--selected professional associations and their regional offices,
--the Chief State School Officers,
--selected foundations,
--selected institutions of higher education
--Superintendents of Education.

To the author's knowledge, little of what the Council has done or, more importantly, is trying to do, has been carried into the professional areas of education through journal articles or speeches. Only 15% of the members said they have ever published articles noting the work of the Council. Although it was not asked, only a few said that they had addressed any local, state, or national groups about the Council. When asked about other Council members who might have done so, the "Chairman" was the most frequent response. Some mentioned the executive directors in connection with releasing Council documents to the professions and the press. One recent example has been the use of the Council's report on community and junior colleges by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges at an annual meeting. The past Chairman was instrumental in bringing this about.

In response to the statement:" Advisory Councils seem to be used more as 'window dressing' or for public relations rather than for genuine advisory work" over 70% of the members "agreed" or "tended to agree." Some members mentioned that "no one listens."

For advisory councils in general, needed improvements have been carefully set out in The Role and Effectiveness of Federal

Advisory Committees, previously mentioned (43). Some of these have been: evaluation and follow-up of the public reports, independent funding, better education and training of the Chairman and staff on the use and management of a council, and clearly defined scope and mission for a council. For the most part, the EPD Council members responding to the questionnaire mentioned similar improvements. A few thought the central question should be whether to have councils rather than how to improve them. One of the most strongly worded statements was:

> "As presently constituted I do not see any justification for the Advisory Council of EPD. It is a waste of time and money and I suspect this is true for many other advisory councils."

While this was a minority opinion, it is evidence of the condition described by a Council member who put in a "vast amount of time" (self-description):

> "The statute creating the Council was adequate. I doubt, however, that it was taken seriously even by its congressional committees. Unless the Congress intends to consider the reports of its councils, it would be better served to spend the funds in more useful endeavors. The present system breeds cynicism." (emphasis added)

Seven members of the Council resigned before the expiration of their terms; generally because of other heavy commitments. Some who are appointed are unaware of the "vast amount of time" necessary for effective participation. Council members must respond to staff work and set the policy directions for the staff. To be effective requires carefully considered decisions from both sides--a partnership of the "executive" (staff) and the "legislative" (Council members).

For those who have been willing to exert this hard work in the public interest, improvements in the system are long overdue.

References

1. 81 Stat. 82; Enacted June 29, 1967. P.L. 90-35
2. Ibid.
3. The Role and Effectiveness of Federal Advisory Committees. Forty-third report by the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, December 1970 (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970)
4. Presidential Advisory Committees: Hearings Before the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, March 1970 (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970)
5. Ibid.
6. Advisory Committees: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations, June 1971 (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971)
7. Op. Cit.
8. 86 Stat. 770; Enacted October 6, 1972. P.L. 92-463
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. 88 Stat. 484; Enacted August 21, 1974. P.L. 93-380
12. T.E. Cronin and N.C. Thomas, Science, 171, p. 771-779, 1971
13. Ibid.
14. Op. Cit.
15. Council letter, July 9, 1973
16. Ibid.
17. Op. Cit.
18. Council memorandum, October 12, 1972
19. The Washington Post, March 15, 1974, D7.
20. Op. Cit.
21. Op. Cit.
22. For an extended debate on Educational Renewal, see Congressional Record, February 28, 1972, p. S 2708-2732.
23. Op. Cit.
24. Council minutes, March 22, 1968
25. Council transcripts, July 16-17, 23-24, 1968.
26. Educational Researcher, Vol XX, No. 7, p. 5, 1969
Journal of Teacher Education, Vol XX, No. 4, p.403-4,544, 1969
27. Council letter, June 9, 1970
28. Council unpublished document,"An Inquiry Concerning the Early Childhood Training Program,Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, September 1970
29. Council memorandum, October 2, 1970
30. Council minutes (draft), October 1970
31. Council draft reports: December 19, 1972, undated report 1971-72.
32. Council letter, August 7, 1970
33. Council letter, November 12, 1970
34. Memorandum to the Council, May 20, 1971
35. Council unpublished document,"The Role of Evaluation in Federal Education Training Programs." David Cohen, Walter McCann, et al, December 1, 1971
36. Op. Cit.
37. Letter to the Council, November 8, 1971
Internal memorandum, November 24, 1971
38. Council minutes, March 16, 1972
39. Council minutes, March 17, 1972
40. Council minutes, May 19, 1972
41. T. O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow (The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona, 1972)
42. Op. Cit.
43. Op. Cit.

APPENDIX A

MEMBERS OF THE

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

* Lyle E. Anderson, Jr. (1973)+
Chairman
School Board of Broward County
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

Waldo R. Banks, Sr.(1972)
President, American Education
Economic Assistance Foundation
Carson, California

William S. Banowsky (1972)
President, Pepperdine University
Malibu, California

* Larry J. Blake (1970, 1971)
President, Flathead Valley
Community College
Kalispell, Montana

Jason E. Boynton (1972)
Associate Professor of Education
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire

R. Creighton Buck (1970,1973)
Professor of Mathematics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Judy Ann Buffmire (1974)
Director, Rocky Mountain Regional
Resource Center
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Oliver C. Carmichael (1971)
Chairman of the Board
Associates Corporation of
North America
South Bend, Indiana

Jennie A. Caruso (1971)
Dean of Women
Maple Heights West Junior
High School
Maple Heights, Ohio

Alfred D. Chandler, Jr. (1970)
Chairman, Department of History
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Jon William Clifton, B.D. (1970)
Parma Heights
Ohio

Sister Mary Corita, IHM (1967)
Professor of Art
Immaculate Heart College
Los Angeles, California

Howard Coughlin (1971)
President, Office and Professional
Employees International Union
New York, New York

George O. Cureton (1970)
Reading Consultant
East Orange, New Jersey

Mildred M. Curtis (1974)
Washington, D.C.

Don Davies (1967)
Executive Secretary
National Commission on Teacher
Education and Professional
Standards
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Adron Doran (1967)
President
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky

Helen G. Edmonds (1973)
Dean of the Graduate School
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina

* Chairman of Council
\+ Year of Appointment

Annette Engel (1967)
Coordinator, Counseling Services
Roosevelt School District
Phoenix, Arizona

Janet C. Erickson (1973)
San Marino, California

Rupert N. Evans (1968,1970)
Dean, College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Hertzel Fishman (1970)
President, Sciences and
Arts Camps, Inc.
New York, New York

Byron F. Fullerton (1970)
Assistant Dean, School of Law
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Susan W. Gray (1967)
Director, Demonstration and
Research Center for
Early Education
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee

* Laurence D. Haskew (1967)
Professor of Educational
Administration
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Thomas R. Hills (1972)
Associate Professor of
Political Science
Black Hills State College
Spearfish, South Dakota

Sidney Hook (1971)
Professor of Philosophy
New York University
New York, New York

M. Elizabeth Jacka (1972)
Executive Vice President
National Merit Scholarship
Corporation
Evanston, Illinois

Julia Mills Jacobsen (1973)
c/o The President's Office
Lynchburg College
Lynchburg, Virginia

Marvin D. Johnson (1971)
Vice President for
University Relations
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

E. Leonard Jossem (1967)
Chairman, Department of Pysics
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Marjorie S. Lerner (1967)
Principal
George T. Donoghue Elementary School
Chicago, Illinois

Ralph F. Lewis (1972)
Editor and Publisher
The Harvard Business Review
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Kathryn W. Lumley (1967)
Director, Reading Clinic
Public Schools of the District
of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Henry Lucas, Jr. (1974)
Franklin Hospital Medical Building
San Francisco, California

Carl L. Marburger (1967)
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Trenton, New Jersey

Ted. F. Martinez (1970)
Director of the Student Union
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Paul H. Masoner (1970)
Dean, School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Edward A. Medina (1974)
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

Edward V. Moreno (1967)
Executive Secretary of the
Mexican-American Commission
Los Angeles City School Districts
Los Angeles, California

Janet Morgan (1970)
Guidance Director
South St. Paul High School
South St. Paul, Minnesota

Lloyd N. Morrisett (1967)
Vice President
The Carnegie Foundation
New York, New York

Arnulfo L. Oliveira (1972)
President, Texas Southmost College
Brownsville, Texas

Lucius H. Pitts (1970)
President, Paine College
Augusta, Georgia

Joseph S. Radom (1973)
Jaffe, Snider, Raitt, Garrat
and Heuer
Detroit, Michigan

* Mary Rieke (1967, 1970)
Chairman
Board of Education
Portland, Oregon

Hugo A. Sabato (1974)
Vice President
G.R. Hammerlein Agency, Inc.
Cincinnati, Ohio

Martin W. Schoppmeyer (1973)
Professor of Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas

Theodore R. Sizer (1967, 1970)
Dean
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dudley Swim (1971)
Chairman of the Board
National Airlines
Monterey, California

Walter Tice (1975)
President, Yonkers Federation
of Teachers
Yonkers, New York

Bernard C. Watson (1967)
Associate Superintendent
Philadelphia School System
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Judith H. Williams (1970)
Coventry
Connecticut

APPENDIX B

Reports of the

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

1. First Annual Report, January 1968.
2. Second Annual Report, January 1969.
3. Evaluation of Educational Programs, May 1969.
4. Leadership and the Educational Needs of the Nation, October 1969.
5. Windows to the Bureaucracy, January 1972.
6. People for the People's College, March 1972.
7. Report on Educational Renewal, May 1972
8. Vocational Education, November 1973.
9. Evaluation of Education, December 1973.
10. Search for Success, June 1974.